9/23/76

Dear Paul,

I appreciate your call a few minutes ago, the time, the explanations and other aspects of the situation you did not address. One is that your friend can react well, if I'm going to have troubles the hell with it. As long as a Lane lives there will be such problems and as long as people worry about them they will not do worthwhile work then can and should do.

Lane has been a thief and a commercializer for years. As an investigator he could not find pubic hair in an overworked and underclean whorehouse - at rush hour. This is complicated by his own egomania, which he attributes to all others, including me in particular. He is not a particularly good thief, having been lulled by nobody ever doing anything about it. This situation has changed so radically I have no choice: I must and I've begun. So far it is limited. For example, out there when I was asked to do a broadcast on this I was as forthright as I could possibly be - and on using words like crook. I will be doing more. I've several proposals out on articles. I do not want to do more than is necessary.

It has come to the point where at my age and in my condition regardless of all the other work for which I cannot find time I have to address this in part to protect myself but more importantly in the national interest. Lane is also a corrupter. His sick ego drives him to baseless improvisations on what he steals. The Holloman case I mentioned this morning is one example. I have his writing on this, in an effort to make some credentials for himself. My present obligation is to try to prevent a new disaster to truth in the House investigation and this means having to confront the crazy stuff he is up to.

Here, as I told you, Les has already begun. He and his paper, which may elect to do nothing, are outraged. Jim has made some copies of Les' stories. When I get them I'll send them to you. I put them in evidence in what is my suit, as you know, not Lane's, on I think May 4 5. That does not eliminate the copyright. Aside from this all being my work or beginning with me, court use does not waive copyright. But I have a tape of a Lane broadcast of 4/15 in which he said "I uncovered" all this. Or the part he was able to try to duplicate. Here he crossed the legal line, as he has elsewhere.

He is a disaster in particular to liberals, who are attracted by his glibness and his espousals of what they believe it. They do not realize he is only exploiting them and issues and brings great harm down on all. Garrison is one of the better examples. Don Edwards, whether or not he realizes it, is another recent one. I think Edwards knows that his teeth were kicked. He may not know how the FBI came to do it. It was his trust in Lane's exploitation of the exploitable without even remembering his own fabrications of the past and palming them off as reality on Edwards.

There are few real experts in the fields in which I work. On King only Jim Lesar is one. He has been doing the legal work from the beginning. On JFK perhaps the best other one is Howard Roffman. There are a few others with substantial knowledge but they have long records of faulted judgements. Most of the rest are, like Lane, bullshitters. They may be bright but they are bogged down in the morass of disinformation they become the foster-parents of.

When we could see what was afoot clearly enough Jim consulted a lawyer whose expertise is in publishing law. I am protected by more than the copyright law and in ways that are more clearly established in case law. I am not going into this because I am not a lawyer and because I do not believe it is the proper basis. I'd rather th have it on an ethical, moral and factual basis, on the basis of who did the work. However, I am not forgetting the legal situation and knowing Lane as I do I am sure it will come to where I do have to take the steps about which I have already put NBC on notice.

It happens that today's mail has some of the evidences of it. After we

spoke I walked out for the mail. I've only opened the letter from the Archives. I'll read it carefully later and respond, if response is called for, then. I'll also be copying it for Jim. Skimming the enclosures indicates that there is enough of an endorsement on some first pages, like from the CIA, to tell who is really doing the work others like Lane in particular ripp off and seek to commercialize. I can't do this kind and this amount of work and lay court to Hollywood or New York. When I make the copies I'll send some of these first pages to you. You know the FBI's endorsement that is in Post Mortem. In plain English they told the court I know more about the JFK events and the FBI's investigation than anyone in the FBI. These are, I think, unique credentials.

Moral, ethical and legal considerations aside this gets to the quality and the quantity of what I offer that others do not and cannot. The work, basically, is mine.

I do not want to misrepresent the legal situation to you. There is one area in which, aside from bsuiness law, I have no protection. This is under the FOIA, which I was largely responsible for getting amended. I have the Congressional Record on this. What I get becomes available to others. It is now a minor industry to duplicate my requests. This means I fight a hard case, in the kind evidence now I think 8 calendar calls and two days of evidentiart hearings in court alone, and a crook like Lane can come along and merely write a letter and thereby obtain what I get. This does not, however, given them understanding. They can read English and not get its meaning. I have a curent case of this. Yesterday I wrote as much of it as I could for an addition to my third book, which I have to reprint. Another current instance is records that others also have, CIA records. The Jack Anderson people were fed it by another. They called me to get its meaning. I expect one of his associates as soon as he has the time. Comprehnding requires both a know-how and details, factual knowledge.

You remember my telling you I have the records for another non-fiction Seven Days in May? Dozens of people now have those identical records. This includes several lawyers. They neother understand them not have the knowledge that lets them fill in what the CIA masked in making the copies. I do have the non-CIA records which fill in all the gaps.

Matter of fact, Les Whitten came to see me in the hospital. We had one he could not solve but he knew it could be a good story. He showed me a record that had been leaked to him, I read it in haste, told him who to call, what to ask for, and what he'd get and find that it meant. This is how last October we established the FBI's back channel on all this political stuff. And he is an expert in such matters. Yet he told me that I am the last of a dying breed, real investigative reporters. All the current crop depend on leaks. He included himself. Leaks and sources.

The interviews Lane is talking about are with those who fall within my work and in one case work I turned over to Les Payne. This is not safe for the use of others nor is it for stealing. Lane could not care less because others will have to defend, not he. He'll get the kicks he wants and that is his life. More literally than you may know.There a is not chance, even with this work to follow up on, that he will have anything new.

Lane is also a symbol. But in his own right he began by wanting to get Earl Warren. With what the Warren court was doing? And by exculpating the Hoovers and the CIAers? This is liberalism or progressive belief or practise? This was also the beginning of my understand of the bright guy's twisted mind. He actually edited all verbatim transcripts to eliminate the names of all the lawyers who really did the dirty work so the reader would have the names of liberals only, Warren and Rankin in particular. He makes all the dirty-workers anonymous by referring to them merely as "counsel" and by replaing their names and those of the witnesses, the names that actually appear in the transcripts that were published, with Q and A. With the changed situation anyone who deals with him is asking for trouble. He is, I think, a real psychopath. Persuasive, articular but still crazy. His major defections from his new CCI have, I'm told, said this to his face.

He is not going to survive this one because he has permitted me no choice. My regret is that it confuses and obliterates so much that is worthwhile. Best regards and thanks,